

individual members and nearly 100 institutional members, representing every country in Europe. The purpose of the ENHR Working Groups is to further research on particular topics of housing research. Members of working groups usually come from a variety of academic disciplines and from different parts of Europe. There are two working groups that specialize on the issue of housing and migration: Migration, Residential Mobility and Housing Policy (Coordinators: Roland Goetgeluk and Maarten van Ham) and Housing and Minority Ethnic Groups (Coordinators: Gideon Bolt and Sule Özüekren; see: <http://www.enhr.ibf.uu.se/wg.html>).

EUROCITIES

EUROCITIES is a network of major European cities founded in 1986. The network aims to promote the sharing of knowledge and ideas, the exchange of experiences, the analysis of common problems, and the development of innovative solutions. It organizes forums, working groups, projects and conferences.

Within the social affairs forum, a working group on migration deals with questions of integration. The working group is chaired by the city of Rotterdam. In 2005, EUROCIITIES published political recommendations to national governments and EU institutions. In these recommendations, EUROCIITIES members requested that the European Council and the Commission “*should recognize the pivotal role of cities in the reception and integration process*” and recommended that the Commission “*develop a consultation framework with the large cities and their associations in Europe*”. Members of the Working Group on Migration come from the cities of Aarhus, Berlin, København, Helsinki, Leeds, Leipzig, Malmö, Roma, Rotterdam, Southampton, Stockholm, Tampere, Turku, Utrecht, Vantaa and Vienna (see: <http://www.eurocities.org/>).

3 Key concepts

3.1 The concept of integration

There is still a lot of ambiguity in the way in which integration is defined. The term “integration” is employed in different contexts, including in socio-economic, legal, political or cultural contexts and dimensions of the integration process, which contributes to the variety of meanings associated with the term. A cross-national comparison indicates that the term has been given numerous different meanings with thus diverging political implications. Despite a lack of explicit definitions of integration, the term is used in different European countries in different ways, which can be polarized as follows:

1. **integration as diversity** in a multi-cultural society without any obligation of assimilation;
2. **integration as a process of assimilation** and perfect acculturation into the social class value system;

3. **integration as a process between diversity and implicit assimilation.**

However, at least in academic literature there is some consensus concerning the analytical definition of integration and its different dimensions:

1. **Cognitive integration** (culturation or socialization) as the transmission and the acquisition of knowledge, cultural standards and competences by an individual necessary for successfully interacting in a given society.

2. **Structural integration** (placement) refers to an individual's acquisition and occupation of relevant positions in society (e.g. in educational and economic systems, on the labour market, in occupational hierarchies, in the housing market). Structural participation is connected with the acquisition of certain rights that belong to particular positions in society and with the opportunity to establish relevant social relations and to win cultural, social and economic capital.

3. **Social integration** (interaction) refers to the formation of networks and social relations, the establishment of friendships, and love or marriage relations across group boundaries. Segregated housing is likely to have an impact on social relations, but existing networks and social relations may also contribute to the segregation process.

4. **Identificatory integration** means that actors see themselves as an element of a collective body. Identification has cognitive and emotional sides and results in a „we-feeling“ towards a group or a collective.

These four dimensions of integration are affected by the housing situation of groups with ethnic and migratory background in different ways. Within CLIP it is assumed that the cognitive dimension, the acquisition of knowledge about cultural standards of the receiving society, is negatively influenced by ethnic concentrations of migrants. The less migrant populations live in a mixed ethnicity populated area, the lower the chance that contacts between different groups emerge. The learning process of the migrant, but also of the native/receiving population is handicapped.

The housing situation also affects the structural dimension of integration. Long commute distances to the work place have negative impacts on labour market integration. Ethnic concentrations usually negatively influence the chances of migrant children at school.

Finally, the housing situation impacts the possibilities for and the extent of social interactions and relations as the opportunities for inter-ethnic interactions are sharply reduced in highly segregated areas. In this manner, residential segregation also influences the long-term process of identification of migrants within the receiving society.

3.2 *The concept of segregation*

Urban space is always a socially defined space. The socio-spatial structure of the city can be read like a map recording the structure of society. Segregation is the projection of social structure onto physical space. It describes the empirical fact that social groups are not evenly distributed throughout the territory of a city but concentrated in certain areas, at certain times. Segregation is also a relational term: one group

per se cannot be segregated since that assumes that the group we are comparing it with is not segregated as well. Each social group has its typical places of residence, work, and leisure. Thus defined, segregation is a universal phenomenon and is as old as the city itself. Segregation exists in all cities all over Europe. Although this might sound like a platitude, it is important to start with this conclusion (Häussermann & Siebel, 2001).

3.2.1 Effects of segregation

From the scientific point of view **it is not justified to consider segregation automatically as a socio-spatial or integration problem.** It represents a constant aspect of the spatial organisation of metropolises which gained increasing importance in the context of inclusion of migrants into urban housing markets. The central question is: **Does segregation interfere with, or, on the contrary, facilitate the urban integration of immigrant populations?**

The evaluation of residential segregation is one of the most controversial topics of urban housing and integration policy in the context of immigration. The core of this issue which needs to be investigated is the relationship between residential environment on the one hand and social structure, social interactions and individual behaviour on the other hand. The residential environment can be seen as an opportunity structure, as a structuring context of social interactions, or as a structure that focuses interactions between neighbourhoods and their external environments (see Schönwälder 2007).

The residential environment as an opportunity structure means that residents are exposed to different infrastructures, job opportunities or educational environments. The residential environment also structures the social contacts and networks, and also the transfer of norms, values and behavioural patterns. Finally the residential environmental effects are important due to inhabitants' interactions with external environments, such as the labour market. *“Particularly, it is assumed that a stigmatization of a neighbourhood and its inhabitants decreases, for example, their chances in the labour market”* (Schönwälder 2007, p. 93).

3.2.2 Measurement of segregation and its “scale”

It is obvious that the effects of segregation depend on the “scale”, or in other words, the size of the spatial unit. It makes a difference if it is a big metropolis, a middle sized city of 50,000 to 100,000 people, a smaller town of 5,000 to 20,000 or a small neighbourhood unit. The most frequently used measures of segregation are the Index of Dissimilarity (ID)⁶ and the Index of Segregation (IS). The sizes of the ID and IS are dependent on the size of the areas used in the calculation of these indices. The

⁶ The index of dissimilarity measures the concentration of a group relative to another group. It relates the number of individuals belonging to a group in a certain small area (for example a neighbourhood) to the total number of that group in a larger area (for example a city) and to a reference group.

larger the area in terms of population (and the fewer number of areas), the smaller the chance for an ID or IS with a high value. This means that cities where the calculation is based on a large number of small areas have a greater chance of receiving a high ID or IS value than the metropolises where the calculations are based on only a small number of relatively large areas. This factor impedes comparability between cities within a country and between countries. However, comparisons over time in the same city are relatively unproblematic.

The causes of large-scale segregation may be quite different from those of small-scale segregation. For example, factors such as the spatial location of public amenities that draw primarily on pedestrian traffic and local residents (e.g., elementary schools, playgrounds, shopping areas, etc.), and households' residential preferences play a role in shaping small-scale segregation patterns. In contrast, large-scale segregation patterns might be caused more by labor markets and other economic features of regions, jurisdictional structures (e.g., municipalities, school districts, service districts), income inequality, housing segregation (Yinger, 1995), and historical settlement patterns.

Likewise, the consequences of segregation may also depend on the scale of segregation patterns. Local segregation is likely to affect contact patterns. Large-scale segregation, however, may be more likely to affect the spatial distribution of economic, institutional, and political resources. In addition, the consequences of segregation may be different in scale for different populations. For children, who stay relatively close to home in the course of a day (attending local child care, or elementary schools), patterns of local segregation are likely to be influential. For adults, in contrast, who are more mobile, large-scale segregation patterns linked to employment opportunities and social and institutional resources may be more relevant (see Reardon et al., 2006).

A basic question in segregation research is: Which spatial level is the most appropriate to investigate patterns of spatial segregation? This question is not easily answered, because it depends on the aim of the analysis. When the purpose is to find out the relation between neighbourly contacts and patterns of segregation, it is useful to work with figures on the street or block level (the smallest spatial level), which raises the problem that these figures are almost never available (Musterd & Deurloo, 2002).

Figures on a neighbourhood level (areas with about 2,000–10,000 dwellings) are more often used. In this case figures still refer to the more or less direct living environment of an individual or household. Daily shopping often takes place in the neighbourhood and young children generally go to kindergarten and primary school there. In other words, this level of analysis is appropriate to find out the relation between more or less routine daily activities and patterns of segregation (Van Kempen, 2003: 3). Figures on a district level (larger areas, with maybe even between 20,000 and 100,000 people) are generally not very relevant, because these figures often hide enormous differentiations within areas.

A drawback of most methods of measuring segregation is that census tracts or blocks are treated as independent neighbourhoods. Consequently, they cannot detect patterns of segregation that occur at scales larger or smaller than tracts/blocks. Jar-

gowsky & Kim (2004), and Reardon & O'Sullivan (2004) have developed approaches that yield scalable measures of residential segregation. Giffinger (1998), for example, has shown three values of the indices of segregation (IS) for Turks in Vienna on different spatial scales. For census districts (the largest areas) the value of the IS was 41.7, for census areas it was 50.8 and for housing blocks (the smallest areas) it was 62.9. Giffinger concluded that this might mean that the spatial separation of Turkish migrants is more evident at the disaggregated spatial level of housing blocks. For many European cities, these comparative figures are not possible because data is only available at bigger spatial levels.

3.2.3 Empirical evidence

A lot of literature exists on the various aspects of segregation processes as well as on special analysis of segregation patterns in certain European cities. Many of these studies suffer from one or both of the following drawbacks (see Van Kempen & Özüekren, 1997: 3): They are often merely descriptive and make only a limited attempt to explain the causal factors of ethnic residential segregation. Many studies are carried out in one city only. International comparisons were rare until the 1990s; recently more attempts have been made to compare segregation for example in U.S and European cities or between metropolises in different European states.

The majority of research about segregation belongs to one of the following three categories: a comparison between different groups in certain cities; a comparison of segregation indices and patterns between cities in the same country or in different states, a comparison of segregation through time. The analysis shows a range of factors dependent on the concrete national, urban and local spatial context which can be responsible for specific urban segregation patterns: General factors like economic trends, reduced social welfare, urban and physical planning, housing market related factors (housing market structures, rent regulation, social housing), financial and other limitations of migrant groups, discrimination and preferences.

A broad investigation into social exclusion and its spatial manifestations in European Cities was made by Madanipour et al. (1998). Van Kempen & Özüekren (1998) compared ethnic segregation among a number of European cities. A further study by the same authors (Özüekren & van Kempen, 1997b) was dedicated to housing and urban segregation of Turkish migrants all over Europe. Body-Gendrot & Martiniello (2000) studied the dynamics of social integration and social exclusion at the neighbourhood level. Musterd & Ostendorf (1998) presented a detailed overview about the impact of the welfare state upon urban segregation. Fortuijn et al. (1998) investigated various aspects of international migration and ethnic segregation and their impact on urban areas in Europe. Ethnic segregation in European cities tends to occur more on the level of houses and blocks; it less seldomly occurs at the scale of city districts (White, 1987; Kohlbacher & Reeger, 2003). As Wessel (2000a, b) points out, the potential for ethnic segregation is more likely in most EU countries than some

decades ago. A comparative analysis of segregation in the UK, Sweden and the Netherlands will be edited by Schönwälder (2007).

Van Kempen (2003) made a detailed comparative survey of segregation in Amsterdam, the Hague, Brussels, London, Birmingham, Cologne, Frankfurt, Düsseldorf, Berlin and Vienna. He came to several important conclusions. First, in the course of time the values of the ID do not always decline. In some cases they even (slightly) increase (for example for the Turks and Moroccans in Amsterdam). Second, in many cases they remain more or less on the same level (see for example the Turks and Yugoslavs in Cologne). Third, big differences exist between the same groups in different countries (compare for example the Turks in the Hague, Vienna and Cologne). This might be a strong indication that cultural variables (ethnic choice) do not play a decisive role in the explanation of patterns of segregation, but that other factors (like the availability of housing and allocation procedures) are more important. Fourth, there are differences between different groups within cities (for example between Turks and Poles in Vienna, between Bangladeshis and Indians in London and Birmingham, between Southern Europeans and Moroccans in the Dutch cities). Although Southern Europeans do generally show a lower IS than more recent immigrants (but see Cologne for an exception), it is dangerous to conclude that it is just a matter of time before segregation starts to decline. Lastly he concluded that while considerable differences exist between countries and groups, equal (or sometimes even larger) differences exist between cities within one country. Of course this can be the result of comparing different sized areas, but the differences indicate that even for one single category (e.g. Turks) different spatial patterns may emerge.

Subsequent to riots in some northern UK cities, the claimed existence of communities living parallel lives was seen as a failure of communities and social policy (Cantle, 2001; Ouseley, 2001). Simpson (2004) analysed settlement patterns in UK northern cities and determined that they were racially segregated. He postulated that social policy must address the dynamics of residential location, rather than simply describe the existence of segregation at any point in time. Byrne (1998) analysed the role of ethnicity in complex cities with Leicester and Bradford as examples. Rees et al. (1995) compared the socio-economic geography of ethnic groups in northern British cities. Phillips (1998) made an analysis of black minority ethnic concentration, segregation and dispersal in Britain. Peach (1998) provided an account of how structural economic change in Britain impacted patterns of immigration and the location of ethnic groups. According to Phillips (2002), of recent migrants, those of Indian origin are the most likely to move to the suburbs (outside the main concentration of their ethnic population). For the case of Glasgow compare Aarflot (2001) and Romice (2001). Ratcliffe (2000) and Phillips (2002) found that many South Asians would like to move to areas outside the ethnic neighbourhoods. Perchinig (2002) investigated the socio-spatial segregation in Birmingham in the wider context of race-relations politics. Johnston et al. (2002) found little spatial segregation of ethnic minority groups in London compared to New York.

For a long time in Scandinavia the issue of residential segregation remained a “non-issue” as it was anticipated that social mobility would level out the differences through time (Holt-Jensen, 2004: 6). There are concentrations of foreign-born people in the cities of these countries, but these concentrations hardly suggest an ethnic cohabitation of the kind suggested in British cities (Lithman, 2004; Holt-Jensen, 2002: 9). In Norway, housing policies aim to reduce segregation in cities (Wessel, 2000a, b). Blom (1999) investigated residential segregation in Oslo and concluded that there is no evidence of increasing socio-spatial polarization. The immigrant housing patterns in Sweden were investigated by Andersson (1998). Hansson (1998) prepared an analysis of ethnic spatial housing segregation in a suburb of Stockholm.

Finland can be seen as an exception to the general European urban trend of segregation. Though the majority of people belonging to ethnic minority groups live in the biggest cities, half of them in the Helsinki metropolitan area, urban ethnic segregation is almost non-existent in Finland. However, due to the high unemployment rate among immigrants, a risk of ethnic segregation is embedded within the process of social segregation.

There are a number of studies about ethnic segregation covering many of the metropolises in Germany. Friedrichs (1998a, b) investigated segregation in Cologne and Hamburg. An analysis of segregation and integration was made by Leggewie (2000). A survey of housing and segregation of Turks in German metropolises was prepared by Glebe (1997). Thieme & Laux (1996) investigated residential patterns of the foreign population in the Ruhr Conurbation. Freund (1998) investigated the same for Frankfurt and Hart et al. (1998) did the same for metropolises in former Eastern Germany. Hanhörster (2001) explored ethnic diversity and segregation in German cities. A recent study about the effects of segregation on children and adolescents was presented by Oberwittler (2006). In Germany more multi-ethnic mixed quarters can be found than ethnically dominated structures. For Germany very little reliable data is available about the extent of segregation (AKI-Newsletter 2006: 1–2), though Häussermann & Siebel (2001) postulate that socio-spatial segregation is intensifying in German cities.

In Austria, patterns of segregation in Vienna were analyzed by Dangschat (2000), Giffinger & Wimmer (2002) and Fassmann & Hatz (2004, 2006). In looking at Belgium, Peleman (2002) stressed the positive impact of segregation for social support. Some analyses about residential segregation in Brussels have to be cited (Kesteloot & Van der Haegen, 1997; Kesteloot & Meert, 2000; Kesteloot et al., 2001).

The Netherlands is an example of a well-functioning welfare state where inequalities are moderated by state intervention and political consensus-building. An analysis about the settlement patterns in Amsterdam was made by Perchinig (2003a). Musterd & Ostendorf (1996) investigated segregation patterns of immigrants in Amsterdam. Musterd & Deurloo (2002) analysed spatial segregation and integration of newcomers migrants in Amsterdam.

In France, an analysis of the patterns of residential concentration and segregation of foreigners in the Paris agglomeration was made by Guillon & Noin (1996). Simon

(2000, 2001) studied the cohabitation between ethnic groups in diverse French cities and in Paris. Ethnic segregation in the “*banlieus*” was examined by Merlin (1999) and Stébé (1999).

Southern European cities are characterized by a distinctive type of suburbanisation of the low and middle-low income groups due to the small scale of housing production (Allen, 2000; Fonseca et al., 2002). A comprehensive study of housing in Southern Europe is included in Allen et al. (2004). For the investigation of segregation in Southern European metropolises, Malheiros (2002) and Arbaci (2002, 2004) have to be cited. The case of Athens was also investigated by Emmanuel (2002) and Maloutas (2004). Malheiros (2001) developed a model of ethnic spatial segregation for Southern European cities. He explains that the distinctiveness of ethnic segregation in the south of the EU is determined by four features: (1) poorer housing conditions; (2) high levels of informality; (3) lower levels of segregation associated with more complex patterns of residential distribution; and (4) a higher degree of suburbanisation. The scale of these conditions diverges greatly between the cities in the north and those in the south of the European Union.

In the new member states in East Central and Eastern Europe the situation is quite different from Western Europe. In most post-socialist cities there were and still are neighbourhoods with concentrations of Roma population which are similar to ghettos. For example, in Hungary, the rapid decline of housing estates into slums represents the “time bomb” of urban development (Enyedi, 1998: 33). Segregation-related research focuses on the privatisation of the housing stock. In the market economy segregation processes that had been suppressed under communism, gathered headway. However, immigration to the new EU member states is still moderate, thus most housing estates in the urban agglomerations still have a considerable degree of social mixing (Holt-Jensen, 2002: 12). Nevertheless residential segregation became increasingly prominent in the metropolises of Eastern Europe (Andrusz et al., 1996, Sailer-Fliege, 1999; Vesselinov, 2004).

3.2.4 Segregated area or ghetto?

One of the most overused categories in the contemporary “segregation landscape” is the so-called “ghetto”. The discourse on ghettos also obscures necessary differentiations for the concept of segregation. From the Jewish diaspora in medieval Europe to the Black quarters in the post-Fordist US-American metropolis, the concept of the ghetto has historically designated a spatial environment bound by confinement and seclusion. The concept of the ghetto has served as a social-organisational device using space to reconcile two contradictory purposes: economic exploitation and social ostracisation. So-called ghettoisation is a product of collective violence cemented in urban space. Externally it has deepened the socio-cultural gap between the outcast category and the surrounding population; internally the ghetto has supported a sense of collectivity and pride built upon the stigma imposed from the outside. The ghetto is therefore marked by a fundamental dualism: it shelters as much as it segregates.

Ghettos are characterised by a high concentration of one minority group. In addition, a large share of the total minority population lives in this area. All ghettos are segregated but not all segregated areas are ghettos. Thus residential segregation is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for ghettoisation (Wacquant, 2004: 6; Boal, 1999). Although the social sciences have made extensive use of the term “ghetto” as a descriptive term, they have failed to forge a robust analytical concept of it, relying instead on the common notions taken for granted in the societies under examination. In his semantic and historical analysis of the term, Wacquant detects four constituent elements: stigma, constraint, spatial confinement, and institutional encasement. There is a further distinction to be made between the traditional ghetto, integrated into the dominant society economically, and the new, excluded ghetto, not so integrated (Marcuse, 1997: 228 ff). The involuntary aspect is a very important dimension. *“Without the aspect of coercion, the area is more appropriately described as an ethnic enclave”* (Özüekren & Van Kempen, 1997: 23).

Due to the tradition of welfare policies in European countries, in no European city may there be found the extent of segregation amounting to ghetto situations as those in US metropolises. Although the term “ghetto” has been used in public and political discourse, it should be avoided since existing segregation does not meet the criteria for characterisation as a ghetto, even if it is intended to refer to cultural aspects (local sub-culture) (see Münch, 2006).

There is abundant literature on ghettos in the U.S. (Wacquant, 2005) and there is much talk about ghettos in the media, but how ghettoised are various migrant groups in European cities? Politicians and the media frequently use the term “ghetto” indiscriminately with respect to the situation in Europe. The term evokes negative connotations and indeed polarises the population, though it does not accurately capture the factual situation (see Ellingsen, 2003: 9). *“So far, in European societies, few ghettos can be found [...] spatial segregation will lead to increasing separation of different social and ethnic classes and population categories; in its turn, that will produce ghetto-like developments and will finally result in the disintegration of urban society”* (Fortuijn et al., 1998: 367).

Ethnic concentrations in certain city quarters (e.g. Berlin-Kreuzberg) often labelled as “little Turkey” or “little Istanbul” have led the media and politicians to label this development as a form of ghettoisation. Geographers and other scientists have shown that this categorization is misleading. Housing segregation in Western European cities is almost nowhere as great for minorities as it is for Blacks in American cities. There are few areas where “ghettoisation” amounts to 80 to 90 percent of an area’s population to be of one minority (Huttman, 1991: 21). Analyses on Paris (Simon, 1998) and Greater London (Johnston et al., 2002) suggest that ghettos comparable to U.S. metropolises do not exist in these cities. Whereas the segregation index for African Americans in the United States is about 81 (Lucassen, 2004: 9), the highest levels in Western Europe are about 68 (Bangladeshis in London), and for most groups below 50 (ibid.). Even in some of the most segregated areas such as Kreuzberg

in Berlin, city quarters with high percentages of Turks also include a lot of immigrants from other countries. Important religious, political and ethnic differences neutralise the ghetto effect (Alpheis, 1990). As an analytical concept and based on the situation in European cities, areas with a coefficient of segregation of 60 or more may be classified as ghettos. The development of an ethnic sub-culture or a “parallel society” is often a consequence of living in a so-called ghetto (Heitmeyer, 1996).

One basis for the policy conclusion that ghettos are negative, is that the involuntary allocation of space to any group is undesirable in a democratic society. A second basis relies on the desirability for diversity, for mixing, for open interchange and communication among population groups in a democratic society (see Marcuse, 2001: 3). That even involuntary segregation at the bottom of the urban order does not *eo ipso* produce ethnic ghettos is demonstrated by the fate of the declining French banlieus after the 1980s: “[...] *relegation in these depressed concentrations of public housing at the urban periphery is based on class, not ethnicity*” (Wacquant, 2004: 6).

3.3 *Housing and local housing market*

In Europe there are a broad variety of distinctive housing markets and housing policy approaches. Most European countries have adopted a more or less market approach to housing provision based on home ownership, with different approaches for economically marginalized groups.

3.3.1 **Typology of housing markets**

There are three main policy approaches in housing:⁷ subsidised provision supplemented by rental allowances (e.g. Sweden, France, Great Britain); no subsidised provision, the ownership sector is dominating (Spain, Belgium), and housing markets in transition (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania).

On the basis of the **extent of regulation**, strongly regulated and privately organized housing markets can be classified. Norris (2007: 69) identifies three housing tenure models for the EU-25: a dual, a unitary and a Eastern European housing model.

⁷ During the 1990s marked changes in the tenure structure of most EU member states took place. In many of the northern EU-15 countries state capital subsidies for social housing construction were radically reduced and only partially replaced by personal subsidies in the form of housing allowances. The termination of these construction incentives resulted in a sharp decline in the output of social rented dwellings. Great Britain and the Netherlands also began to privatize their social rented stock by means of sales to the tenants. The combination of these measures, coupled with an easier access to credit due to the liberalization of mortgage lending, led to a diminution in the size of the social rented sector, accompanied by a rise in owner occupation rates (Van der Heijden, 2002: 327 ff).

The dual system is typical for Ireland and Great Britain. Here home-ownership is the dominant tenure and the private-rented sector is unregulated and unsupported by the government. The social rented sector is small and residual and provides some safety net for the most disadvantaged households.

In unitary systems, such as in Denmark, tenure patterns are driven by household preferences rather than government interventions in the housing system. Here the owner-occupied sector is smaller, while the non-profit sector is larger and not exclusively targeted towards marginal groups. The private-rented sector competes on equal terms with social housing.

For the former communist countries the **Eastern European housing model** is typical: housing was defined as a state-guaranteed social right, there was state control over the production and allocation of housing, the level of home ownership was low, the role of the market was constrained and a large proportion of the stock was state-owned. After the collapse of the communist state, the ownership and responsibility for new construction were transferred to local authorities. The reform of property rights and the privatization of the formerly state-owned housing stock to tenants brought a fundamental change to owner occupation.

One regular characteristic of all European housing markets is their segmentation. The housing market usually consists of the following main components: the **rental sector** and the **ownership** sector. The rental housing segment can be divided into private rental housing (the buildings are mostly privately owned or owned by companies and the rents are calculated on the basis of the standard of the flat and its location), public rental housing (also communal or social housing) and the co-operative rental housing (the stock belongs to housing associations).

From the perspective of tenancy law one distinguishes between two types of tenancy agreements: **chief tenancy** (the tenancy agreement is signed between the apartment seeker and the owner of the building and not registered in the real estate register) and **subtenancy** (the tenancy agreement has been signed between the apartment seeker and the chief tenant). In the ownership sector (or owner-occupied housing), there are sub-segments – those with and those without mortgage.

In many EU Accession States in Eastern Europe condominium ownership is widespread. Condominium ownership became prevalent during the privatisation of the multi-flat housing stock. Many low-income owners are members of the condominiums. For these households, the financial obligations required for membership in a condominium are unsupportable. Most multi-flat housing is in need of urgent renovation and condominiums often do not possess the necessary resources.

3.3.2 Accessibility

Access to decent and affordable housing is of key importance for social inclusion. Although the key importance of access to housing for social inclusion is generally recognised, policy-makers – especially at the EU level – tend to downplay this relation. It is very common to read in EU documents that employment is the key to social in-

clusion. Although employment is indeed very important, access to decent housing in a suitable location is often a pre-condition to accessing decent employment that would allow for full integration into society.

Thus, a crucial aspect for the integration of migrants is the accessibility of the housing market system for migrants and minorities. Housing policies and integration strategies often ignore housing access and do little to assist legal migrants in accessing the housing market. As a result, migrants access housing in the context of a predominantly privately organized housing market and during an era in which social housing everywhere in Europe becomes more market oriented. Even in non-profit housing, private financial means becomes more and more important. Though the tenement structures in Europe are characterized by considerable variation, in most countries a decline in the privately rented housing sector (the segment upon which migrants mainly depend) can be observed.⁸

Legal status and ethnic origin are key factors affecting access to the housing market for migrants. Major barriers to migrants' ability to access housing are a lack of appropriate information about the local housing market, its functions and the manner to obtain access to decent housing (which is particularly important for new arriving migrants), a deficit of organised support and advice (this is particularly important for new arriving migrants), direct, indirect and structural discrimination and a lack of financial resources. Difficulties in accessing credit and mortgage facilities are reported as further key barriers (Harrison et al., 2005: 64).

The mechanisms influencing access in the different sectors of the housing market are manifold (Edgar, 2004). Usually the **private rent sector** is easy for immigrants to access in most European metropolises. However, even access to this segment of the housing market is influenced by some factors (e.g. regulations of access to housing, household subsidies for tenants, subsidies for house owners and discrimination against migrants). Access to **social housing** is determined by the allocation of the stock by local authorities to tenants, the allocation of funds for public housing by local authorities and by the level of discrimination against migrants in the process of allocation. Access to **co-operative housing** is influenced by the allocation of the stock to tenants by the housing associations and by discrimination against migrants. Access to **private house ownership** is controlled by the local capital market and banks, the provision of land by public authorities and public subsidies.

⁸ Actually, the number of dwellings per 1,000 inhabitants averages 427.9 among all EU-25 countries (EU-15: 461.2) but the accessibility of dwellings varies significantly between the EU-15 and the new former communist member states. In the latter the number of dwellings per 1,000 inhabitants is only 387.2. These numbers do not indicate a serious housing shortage in Eastern Europe. Of course some housing accessibility problems exist among certain groups (e.g. recently formed households) and in certain localities (e.g. in economically booming cities) in the New Member States (Norris, 2007: 66).

On the supply side the lack of rented housing that is affordable, sizeable and meets an adequate standard is the major problem for migrants' integration in the context of housing. In cities with a considerable supply of social or subsidised rental housing, as for example in Vienna, the local municipality has an important policy instrument available to support access. In such cities the key issue is to ensure that the allocation of this stock is transparent, fair and oriented towards the target groups in need. In Swedish and British cities public subsidised rental housing was transferred to non-governmental organizations. In such cases, systems to monitor and regulate the distribution of housing stock are necessary.

Discrimination is a frequent factor affecting access to the housing market for immigrants. Discriminatory mechanisms for migrant and minority ethnic groups contribute to negative outcomes in housing integration (Edgar, 2004). There is empirical evidence that patterns of discrimination and exclusion all over Europe are not random, but have a systematic and persistent character. *"Discrimination happens on the grounds of nationality (Turkish citizens), ethnic origin[,] [...] skin colour (e.g. Africans) and religion (e.g. Muslim women) [...] discrimination is both exercised by landlords, property managers and cooperative building societies as well as neighbours"* (NFP Austria, 2003: 63).

Equal access to housing is an individual right and a collective issue. To guarantee this equality of access, legislation which promotes an active role of the municipality is necessary. Measures must be introduced which allow effective monitoring of the housing market and penalise and correct any discrimination. Identified inequalities should be fought by proactive policies.

3.3.3 Affordability

In recent years housing affordability has become an important factor in the broader context of housing problems in European cities. How is affordability defined? A household is said to have a housing affordability problem when it pays more than a certain percentage of its income to obtain adequate and appropriate housing. Affordable dwellings are a scarce resource, access to which is determined by the tenure balance of the housing market at the local level. Problems of affordability affect low-income households in general, not only migrant groups, but very often migrants are amongst those particularly dependent on subsidised provisions.

The problem with monitoring the affordability of housing in European cities is **its linkage to local incomes in relation to flat prices**. Data on individual incomes are statistically not available in all metropolises of the EU and not for all the spatial units in which empirical analyses would need them. Consequently, average incomes are often the basis of such surveys. As the housing ministries survey failed to produce comparable data regarding affordability, Eurostat data is the only source to assess this key aspect of housing conditions. The share of household consumption devoted to housing, water, electricity and heating varies only marginally between the old and new EU member states. In 2003, households in the EU-15 devoted 20.9% of household con-

sumption to these commodities, compared to 20.3% in the former communist new member states (Norris, 2007: 69). In most of the 10 new member states of the EU people still spend most of the household budget on food, but housing costs are increasing rapidly.⁹

The concept of affordable housing has its roots in studies of household budgets. The definitions of affordable housing are often characterised as a certain percentage of income. A housing expenditure-to-income ratio was used by mortgage lenders and was a part of the selection criteria by private house-owners. The housing expenditure-to-income “rule of thumb” was deemed to be an appropriate indicator of ability to pay. In many studies a 20 percent rule lasted until the 1960s when somehow a 25 percent rule came into use, to be replaced in the 1980s by a **30 percent “rule of thumb”**. Related to this practical assumption about an appropriate relationship between housing expenditure and income are the analyses of economists who asked questions about the relationship between housing consumption and household income. During the 1980s the often undefined term “housing affordability” has come into widespread popular usage in Western Europe with a growing body of literature which, for some part, finds the term problematic.

Empirical surveys criticise that any attempt to reduce affordability of housing to a single percentage of income simply does not correspond to the reality of fundamental differences among households; there is a range of variation in what households can really afford. Also migrant and ethnic minority households can and do pay a great deal or very little for housing, whatever their income level, as data on housing expenditure-to-income ratios demonstrate. A definition of housing need – only based on affordability – is not a valid measure. It fails to account for the diversity in household types, the stage of life of the maintainer(s) of each household, the great diversity in household consumption patterns, and the problem of defining income as only cash income.

3.3.4 Sustainability

As part of the discussions on sustainable development, sustainable housing has emerged as a distinct concept. This concept regularly appears in European Commission documents together with related concepts such as sustainable construction and sustainable renovation. There may be a risk that sustainable housing is considered to be primarily an environmental concept, which would not be in line with the multi-dimensional nature of sustainable development, encompassing economic and social elements. Successful sustainable housing projects for migrants and minorities **have to meet the diversity of needs and to reflect the diversity of the economic, family, ethnic or social status of the various groups of the population**. Sustainable development requires listening to the needs of the tenants and allowing them to take part in

⁹ See European Commission (2005c).

decisions concerning them. Infrastructure and services which are really needed by the local inhabitants should be provided.

Methodically **it is not possible to develop an ideal model for sustainable urban and housing development**. In each city and neighbourhood the criteria differ. Thus, for guaranteeing sustainability, development plans must take into account local conditions. Adequate spatial planning is an important contribution to the sustainability of housing projects. Governance is a key issue in ensuring the sustainability and effectiveness of the response to housing needs. Sustainability can be promoted by decentralizing expertise in municipal housing policies and taking into account public participation and public-private partnerships. The development of a sustainable public policy framework in housing should take into account financial sustainability, quality and standards of services provided, the social mix and household participation.

3.3.5 Physical quality

The physical quality of the house or apartment is another key dimension in every housing analysis. **Four basic amenities – running water, adequate (flush) toilet facilities, a bath/shower and sufficient heating – have become the standard pattern of housing standards in the member states of the EU.** But empirical evidence shows great variation in housing quality and standard conditions across EU Member States, which, together with substantial differences in the depth of data and evidence, make comparative analysis problematic (Edgar, 2004).

In the EU-15, the average floor area of dwellings is 84.4 sqm, whereas in the former communist EU countries it is only 55.7 sqm (Norris, 2007: 66). In Romanian cities, for example, every fifth house is still without running water. In the EU-15, 98.4% of dwellings have running water and 97.8% have a lavatory. In the former communist countries which are now EU-members the equivalent figures are 89.1% and 78.9% (Norris, 2007). But even in a northern metropolises such as Copenhagen (Terp, 2001) and Vienna (Kohlbacher & Reeger, 2006), sub-standard dwellings built during the Founder's Period (before 1918) are still in use. In the City of Copenhagen 16% of the houses were built before 1900. The Vesterbro area in the centre of Copenhagen, for example, is a residential area with 23 blocks and 4,000 apartments for approximately 6,500 inhabitants. 90% of the buildings are pre-1900 as the area was built between 1850 and 1920 near the central station. The housing standard is low and there are a large number of one or two room apartments without central heating and warm water (64%), without a toilet (11%) or a bathroom (71%). The low rents mainly attract people with low income. It is an area with a higher than average percentage of foreign inhabitants.

According to the 2001 Austrian Census, 40.8% of the Turkish migrants and 39.3% of the former "guest-workers" from Serbia living in Vienna were tenants in category-D-dwellings (those without an inside toilet and bathroom and no central heating). In the same year only 5% of the Austrian citizens and 4% of the German elite migrants lived in sub-standard dwellings, whereas 90.5% of the Germans inhabited apartments

of category A. However, compared with the 1991 Census, when 75.6% of the Turks and 68.8% of the Yugoslavians lived in category-D-dwellings, a visible success in the urban renewal policy is reflected in the figures (Kohlbacher & Reeger, 2006).

3.3.6 Over-crowding

The migrants moving to European metropolises are much younger than the average age of local population. As migrant populations have a younger age structure their households are often larger (involving extended families) and their housing needs may also be related to cultural norms (e.g. gender-separation in Islamic families). For these reasons over-crowding is an often observed phenomenon which requires larger accommodation at modest rents. Political solutions to this problem must be sensitive to the different causes of larger households (e.g. extended families, cultural norms). The different groups of migrants and their specific needs have to be taken into consideration as far as housing conditions are concerned (Edgar, 2004).

The measure of overcrowding varies from one survey to the other and between European countries. One standard applied in the measure may be as follows: a maximum of two people per bedroom; single parents and unmarried persons aged 18 and over to have a separate bedroom and children aged 10 to 17 years must only share a room with the same sex. Minority ethnic households often have to live with less space per person in the dwelling compared to native households (see Friedrichs (1998) for Germany). Figures on overcrowding are striking in some countries. Overcrowding is more widespread in the former communist countries, where in 2000 the average number of persons per occupied dwelling was 2.7 compared to 2.5 in the EU-15 (Norris, 2007: 66). More than 40% of all Turkish households in Sweden live in overcrowded situations. For the native Swedes this figure was lower than 4% in 1997 (Özüekren & Magnusson, 1997).

Migrant households have a markedly lower average income but have – due to family size and intergenerational households – a higher demand for living space than native households. In the future, they also tend to depend on the low-cost housing market. In many European metropolises there are serious discrepancies between housing supply and demand, i.e. with regard to unit size. Thus, even if improvements in the urban housing market may be observed, migrants living in overcrowded flats in the low-cost segment do not benefit from an improved situation in the upper and middle market segments.

3.3.7 External environment

In many European cities growing awareness of the importance of the physical dimension of urban social and cultural life is now increasingly being reflected in innovative physical planning and in urban renewal projects. Deprived urban neighbourhoods everywhere in Europe are not only characterized by poor housing but also by an inconvenient external environment. The local vulnerable populations are suffering pri-

marily from the impact of heavy traffic, including noise pollution, toxic fumes and elevated accident rates. Further problems – partially linked to the wider issue of quality of life – are limited outdoor facilities, pollution, litter nuisance and drug-related litter, graffiti, vandalism, prostitution and bad living conditions in general. In many surveys the primary concern expressed by the inhabitants was the effect of road traffic noise on their quality of life. Excessive traffic also has an impact on the local housing market. The **high level of noise** in combination with the number of noise sources negatively impacts the quality of sleep of the local population. An urgent need in these areas would be measures that reduce the impact of traffic, such as a neighbourhood traffic calming scheme. But it is not only traffic noise but also the level of noise from neighbours, which impacts the residents' quality of life.

Neighbourhoods in Central European metropolises, particularly those dominated by Founder's Period housing, suffer from **a lack of open space and green areas**. These quarters in Vienna, Berlin, Hamburg and Budapest are mixed functional neighbourhoods from the late 19th century with predominantly dense clusters of five to six storey buildings. These areas usually have a mix of residential and commercial use buildings. The proportion of business spaces within the neighbourhood is usually fairly high. Those quarters are often surrounded by major traffic routes. One has to emphasize the positive and negative external environmental aspects of these neighbourhoods. On the positive side, residents often refer to the good accessibility of facilities, services and cheap housing costs while on the negative side, they talk about the lack of safe places for children to play outside, problems with the lifts, vandalism and lack of privacy. The lack of safe places where younger children can play unsupervised is particularly an issue for parents of primary school children. This problem is intrinsic to the design and location of the Founder's Period quarters. Public parks with play equipment for young children are often missing as is access to outdoor playing fields and places where teenagers can get together undisturbed by older people.

3.3.8 Personal security in the neighbourhood context

Insecurity has become one of the major concerns of many towns and neighbourhoods in Europe, which are faced with increasing violence, (juvenile) delinquency and large-scale crime. This situation is the result of many factors: persistent unemployment, changes in the family unit, social exclusion, and processes of urbanisation, suburbanisation and gentrification which make little allowance for the harmonious integration of immigrant populations. Europeans feel an increasing sense of insecurity. This is demonstrated by many surveys, whether those conducted regularly by the European Union or that of the United Nations in 1995 when a survey of 135 towns on all five continents placed insecurity third among the concerns of mayors. Urban insecurity has also been addressed in reports by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE) (see Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, 2001). Many recent political elections in Europe have largely revolved on this issue.

Extremist political movements have seized upon insecurity and coupled it with their habitual variations on xenophobia.

Usually there is a sharp distinction between the subjective feeling of personal security held by the local residents and the objective conditions in a neighbourhood. On the whole, people feel safer in their neighbourhood during the day, although there are some places where even this feels unsafe. During hours of darkness, however, people feel markedly less safe even in their immediate neighbourhood.

The most important factors which contribute to peoples' feelings of insecurity are people hanging about, poor lighting, parks and green areas and places for strangers to hide. Lonely places and the presence of drunks are also of significant concern, as are subways and alleyways. In general, people living in urban areas feel safer in areas which are busy with people. Women feel less safe than do men. Women are more worried about being the victim of a street-based crime and worry more about sexual assault. Younger people are least likely to feel unsafe, while people over 45 years are more likely to either feel unsafe, or simply not go out after dark. Young women are still more likely than young men to feel unsafe and they are more fearful than older women of sexual assault. In particular "visible" ethnic minority residents are more likely to feel unsafe walking alone in their neighbourhood than are their white counterparts. This can be observed in the case of black Africans or Asians in cities of Great Britain and Germany as well as for Roma in Eastern European metropolises.

3.3.9 Selected empirical findings: housing and migrant groups

Minority ethnic groups generally concentrate in the rental sector, while they are under-represented in the owner-occupied sector. For example, in Denmark and the Netherlands, 92% of the Turkish households are renting, in Sweden and the German city of Düsseldorf this figure is as high as 98%. In Belgium and France, 85% of the Turks are tenants. This pattern is largely a consequence of their low and insecure incomes (Van Kempen and Özüekren, 1998a, 2002). In many countries, like Belgium, France and Germany, there is a clear increase of owner-occupation among minority ethnic groups (De Villanova, 1997; Glebe, 1997; Kesteloot et al., 1997). In the Belgian city of Ghent, for example, the vast majority of Turks are now owner-occupiers.

Substantial differences in housing conditions and tenure patterns across different migrant groups can be observed in many European countries and metropolises. In Great Britain, for example, some predominantly Muslim communities (Pakistanis and Bangladeshis) are more likely than other minorities to live in overcrowded housing, and also the most likely to be living in poor housing conditions in terms of unfitness or serious disrepair (NFP UK, 2003: 20).

In Portugal (NFP Portugal, 2003: 40) and Austria (NFP, Austria, 2003), different patterns of housing are emerging in relation to different groups. In Vienna, subsidised housing plays a major role. Along with direct housing construction subsidies, indirect housing construction subsidies are provided through fiscal incentives. The aim of the Austrian housing construction subsidy scheme is to build affordable housing for a

large part of the population. Austrian housing policy has predominantly been supply-side policy. It is a fact that the present system of housing subsidisation creates some advantages for the middle class, this includes economically successful middle-class migrants. In recent years housing construction subsidies have assumed an important role as a financing instrument in subsidised housing construction in the non-profit housing sector.

The demand and supply conditions on the local housing markets over time are an important determinant of the availability of affordable and decent housing in general and the availability for migrants in particular. Even in European cities with a large communal housing sector, it is often private market decisions that determine the allocation of the housing stock.

4 The effects of segregation and access to affordable housing on integration

4.1 Effects of affordability

It is common to find the housing expenditure-to-income ratio being used as a rule for defining concrete housing needs of migrants in municipal housing policy and for programme purposes; this characterisation is often referred to as the housing affordability problem. The selection of a ratio of housing expenditure-to-income has become a commonly used statement about the scope of housing affordability. But to define everyone spending more than 30% of his income on housing has an affordability problem is too simple because consumption patterns of migrant households are diverse. The formula uses a subjective assertion about what constitutes an affordable housing expenditure as the basis to measure what is affordable for all households. This kind of generalisation is based on an assumption about the cash income of migrants required to pay for the necessities of life. The use of the ratio is not a reliable method for defining the housing needs of migrants. Firstly, it does not account for household size; secondly, it fails to reflect changes in household expenditures; thirdly, it is not adjusted for the substitutions available to the households; fourthly, it only relies on official income.

Of course, affordability is playing a role in housing for migrants. For the public housing sector a maximum income measure is used as a cut-off instrument to exclude higher income households from the subsidised housing sector. This is also relevant for well-to-do migrant households. On the contrary, in co-operative housing a minimum income measure is used as a cut-off point to exclude lower income households from access to the rental units. In the case of minority ethnic households, explanations of housing and segregation patterns that stress the importance of income, the supply of dwellings and the accessibility of dwellings are generally more adequate than explanations that put forward the preferences and choices of individuals and households.